REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
Addendum # 1

King County

Department Of Executive Services
Finance and Business Operations Division
Procurement and Contract Services Section
206-684-1681 TTY RELAY: 711

Date Issued: February 23, 2006

RFP Title:	**District Court Staffing Study**
Requesting Dept./ Div.:	**King County District Court**
RFP Number:	**111-06CMB**
Due Date:	**March 2, 2006 - 2:00 P.M.**
Buyer:	**Cathy M. Betts**, *cathy.betts@metrokc.gov* (206) 263-4267

This addendum is issued to revise the original Request for Proposal, dated February 16, 2006 as follows:

1. The proposal opening date remains the same: Thursday, March 2, 2006 no later than 2:00 p.m. exactly.

The following information is provided in response to questions received:

Q1: A reference is made to council funding. What is the authorized amount?

A1: $60,000

Q2: There is no time frame listed in the RFP. Is there some outside limit?

A2: The project draft report is due by June 1, 2006.

(continued on page 2)

TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR AWARD OF A CONTRACT, THIS ADDEMDUM MUST BE SIGNED AND SUBMITTED TO KING COUNTY

Sealed proposals will only be received by:
King County Procurement Services Section, Exchange Building, 8th floor, 821 Second Avenue, Seattle, WA 98104-1598. Office hours: 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., Monday - Friday

Company Name		
Address		City / State / Postal Code
Signature	Authorized Representative/Title	
Email	Phone	Fax

This Request for Proposal – Addendum will be provided in alternative formats such as Braille, large print, audiocassette or computer disk for individuals with disabilities upon request.

If you received or downloaded this document in .pdf format, a MS Word copy may be obtained by contacting the buyer listed above. This MS Word document will be transmitted by e-mail.

Q3: What do we do if none of the SBED companies or individuals has backgrounds in the areas covered by the study? Most appear to be construction-related.

A3: "SEDB" participation shall be counted only for SEDBs performing a commercially useful function according to custom and practice in the industry. A commercially useful function is defined as a specific scope of work for which the SEDB has the management and technical expertise to perform using its own workforce and resources. Please remember, your firm or subcontractors must be certified and assigned Certification Number by the County prior to bid submittal time. (See Part 4 in the RFP document.)

Q4: Three groups are mentioned: District Court leaders, the Executive Committee, and a committee for the study. Do we report separately to all three? Is this entirely a District Court undertaking or are there other stakeholders on the study committee?

A4: Report will be sometimes separately and sometimes combined to the Executive Committee. Leadership Team will be less frequent while meeting with the Study Committee will be more frequent.

Q5: Is there an expectation level on the reporting to each group mentioned in Question 4 (i.e. meetings for each held monthly, or one meeting for all groups monthly or some groups less frequent than others, etc.)

A5: Meetings with the Executive Committee, Leadership Team will be less frequent while meetings with the Study Committee will be more frequent.

Q6: Can reporting to the groups mentioned in Question 4 occur (sometimes) through video conference or telephone conference rather than on-site meetings?

A6: Video or telephone conference meetings, rather than on site meetings, will be acceptable sometimes, depending on content and participants.

Q7: The RFP calls for consideration of changes already made. What are these changes?

A7: Changes already implemented are listed in the RFP itself. Please reference the following statements:

The District Court is the most technologically advanced court of limited jurisdiction in the State, including effective use of an electronic records management and retention system, consolidated DISCIS database, video conferencing, digital recording systems, electronic forms for staff and judges, computers, printers, scanners, e-mail, fax, automated reminder calling for upcoming hearings, and web based interpreter management. The implementation of an electronic master calendaring system, upgrade to the call center technology and implementation of electronic time keeping for all staff is scheduled for 2006.

During the past 5 years the District Court has undergone drastic changes in its size (including staffing levels and number of judges), governance and administrative structure, operations, facilities, responsibilities, reliance upon technology, and case management systems.

- *Contain the flexibility to respond to changing conditions, particularly evaluating the staffing need changes resulting from recent technological improvements (including ECR and a single DISCIS database) and from the new bargaining agreement for union represented staff that resulted in a change of work week hours from 35 to 40 and the implementation of a flex schedule for a portion of the staff, as of January 1, 2005.*
- *Be consistent with the strategic directives set forth in the newly adopted District Court Operational Master Plan (OMP).*

Q8: There is reference in the RFP to weighting case types. Since this has already been done, do we use these weights as the basis?

A8: Possibly.

Q9: Can we include work samples with our proposal response?

A9: Work samples may be included with proposal responses.